

REMARKS

The Examiner has maintained the latest rejection. Applicant still purports that such rejection is deficient. However, in the spirit of expediting the prosecution of the present application and bringing closure to this matter, applicant has incorporated, at least in part, the subject matter of Fig. 3 of the originally filed specification into each of the independent claims.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Coss et al. (U.S. 6,098,172). Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove.

Specifically, now claimed in each of the independent claims is the following subject matter:

“wherein the security policy is defined by a policy file which includes a policy file data structure stored as an XML (extensible markup language) document;

wherein a security policy section of the policy file data structure includes an entry for each security policy that is identified by a policy identifier field and is associated with a network protocol that is identified by a protocol identifier field;

wherein the security policy section specifies filters for at least a portion of ports and services defined by the network protocol, and each port and service associated with the security policy is identified by an element identifier field, a field containing filter settings, and a log indicator field;

wherein at least one security policy is included for a TCP/IP network and includes a PPTP (point-to-point tunneling protocol), a RIP (routing information protocol), a DHCP (dynamic host configuration protocol), an ARP (address resolution protocol), an Ident (identification protocol), ICMP (internet control message protocol) and VPN (virtual private networking) ports, and a NetBIOS (network basic input/output system) service;

wherein a default setting for a high security policy on the TCP/IP network disallows incoming network traffic through the PPTP and ICMP ports, allows incoming

network traffic through the RIP, DHCP, ARP and VPN ports, disallows access through the NetBIOS service to shared resources on the individual computer, and disallows the individual computer from using shared resources of other computers on the TCP/IP network, where incoming network traffic that attempts to access the individual computer using PPTP and NetBIOS is logged;

wherein a zone section of the policy file data structure includes an entry for each defined address zone and includes an identifier field, an address parameters field that defines the zone, and an identifier field for the security policy assigned to the zone;

wherein a default zone is defined by addresses that are outside another zone" (see each of the independent claims).

Thus, now claimed is a security policy data structure that provides enhanced automatic configuration of a firewall to optimize the ability thereof to protect an associated computer.

The Examiner is reminded that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.* 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

This criterion has simply not been met by the Coss reference, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove. A notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of all of applicant's claim limitations, in combination with the remaining claim elements, is respectfully requested.

To this end, all of the independent claims are deemed allowable. Moreover, the remaining dependent claims are further deemed allowable, in view of their dependence on such independent claims.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. Applicants are enclosing a check to pay for the added claims. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAIIP361).

Respectfully submitted,

Zilka-Kotab PC

Kevin J. Zilka

Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172-1120
408-505-5100